#### NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

## IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

### SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

#### DIVISION SIX

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

SANDRA ANN NAMCHEK,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B294116 (Super. Ct. No. 2017034004) (Ventura County)

Sandra Ann Namchek appeals the judgment entered following her guilty plea to identity theft (Pen. Code, § 530.5, subd. (c)(2)). The trial court suspended imposition of sentence and placed appellant on probation with terms and conditions including that she serve 120 days in county jail.<sup>2</sup>

 $<sup>^{\</sup>mbox{\tiny $1$}}$  All statutory references are to the Penal Code.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> As a condition of her probation, appellant was also ordered to pay a \$300 State Restitution Fund fine (§ 1202.4, subd. (b)). While the appeal was pending, appellant filed a

During a consensual encounter with a police officer, appellant revealed she was on probation. After verifying that appellant was on probation for theft and had active search terms, the officer searched appellant's backpack and found several credit cards issued in the names of other people.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, he filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised. On March 21, 2019, we advised appellant that she had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues she wished us to consider. No response has been received from appellant.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that appellants attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 443; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 126.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

Р	$\mathbf{E}$	K.	R	E)	N	J	

We concur:

GILBERT, P. J.

YEGAN, J.

motion in the trial court challenging the fine pursuant to section 1237.2. The court subsequently found that appellant lacked the ability to pay the fine and ordered it stayed. (See *People v. Dueñas* (2019) 30 Cal.App.5th 1157, 1164, 1172-1173.)

# Bruce Young, Judge Superior Court County of Ventura

\_\_\_\_\_

Richard B. Lennon, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.